



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to use language more full, comprehensive, and unmistakable, than that which we have quoted above from the authorized indulgences, not of one, but of several Popes? Is this a specimen of the infallible teaching of the Church of Rome, which Christian people are expected to receive in blind and unresisting submission? We confidently appeal to our readers whether, in the whole course of their experience, they have ever met with an instance of more gross and glaring contradiction?

But we need not rely merely on the language of the Papal indulgences. The history of the Church, for the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, proves, conclusively, the meaning which the Church of Rome then intended the people to put, and which they actually did put, on the indulgences issued in her name, and with her express sanction. Of this, the ancient writer, Gobelinus, furnishes us with a remarkable proof.* He says that the preachers of indulgences told the people, to encourage them to deal with them, that the indulgences were not only a *pena*, but a *culpa* too—i.e., not merely from the temporal punishment of sin, but from the fault itself, which deserved eternal punishment. This made the people look into them; and not finding those terms, but only a most plenary remission, they were unsatisfied, because they were told the fault could only be forgiven by God alone; but if they could but once find that the Pope would undertake to clear all scores with God for them, they did not doubt but the indulgences would be worth their money. "Whereupon," adds Gobelinus, "those very terms were put into them;" then the wiser men thought these were counterfeit, and made only by the pardon-mongers; but, upon further inquiry, they found it otherwise.

We may add another example from the general form of absolution, sold by Tetzel, under the direct authority of Leo X.† We need scarcely recall to the recollection of our readers, that the shameful sale of indulgences, by Tetzel and others, was the immediate cause of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. The absolution concluded as follows:—"I restore thee to the holy sacraments of the Church, and to the unity of the faithful, and to the innocence and purity conferred on thee by baptism; so that the gates of punishment may be closed against thee at thy departure, and those of the joys of Paradise be opened. Or, shouldst thou not presently die, let this grace remain in full force, and avail thee at the point of death. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—F. B. Johannes Tetzel, Sub-commissionarius, manu propria scripsit."

Can any unprejudiced person read these words without being convinced that the Church of Rome, at that time, plainly and unquestionably intended to persuade the vulgar, that whoever purchased one of these indulgences obtained the remission of all his sins, and the certainty of everlasting happiness? It cannot be disputed that the indulgence professed to confer an entire absolution, not only from all past, but also from all future sins. It is impossible, with any shadow of reason, to affix any other meaning to the concluding paragraph. The dilemma, therefore, to which Cardinal Wiseman is reduced is as follows:—either the doctrine of the Church of Rome is the same now as it was in the time of Tetzel and Leo X., or it is not. If it be the same, then Cardinal Wiseman is not to be believed when he tells us that "an indulgence is no pardon for sin of any sort, past, present, or future."—If it be different, then the Church of Rome must have changed her doctrine since the sixteenth century, and, consequently, she cannot be infallible.

We have given a specimen of the language of the documents which Tetzel sold; but we really feel some reluctance in reproducing some passages of the harangues which he is said to have addressed to the people, and in which he magnified the value of his indulgences:—"At the very instant that the money rattles at the bottom of the chest, the soul escapes from Purgatory, and flies liberated to heaven. . . . I would not change my privileges for those of St. Peter in heaven; for I have saved more souls by my indulgences than the Apostle by his sermons."

Reflect that for every mortal sin, you must, after confession and contrition, do penance for seven years, either in this life or in Purgatory. Now, how many mortal sins are there not committed in a day, how many in a week, how many in a month, how many in a year, how many in a whole life! . . . Alas! these sins are almost infinite, and they entail an infinite penalty in the fires of Purgatory; and now, by means of these letters of indulgence, you can, once in your life, in every case except four, which are reserved for the Apostolic See, and afterwards in the article of death, obtain a plenary remission of all your penalties and all your sins.

There is no sin so great that an indulgence cannot remit; and even if any one (which is, doubtless, impossible) had offered violence to the Blessed Virgin Mary, mother of God, it is as clear as day-light that if he only procures an indulgence, all will be forgiven him!†

We should be sorry to hold the Church of Rome responsible for the daring impiety of such language as we have quoted above; but at the same time, we feel convinced, that Tetzel only carried out to their logical conclusion the principles which had been laid down by various Popes and Doctors before his time. We have not space to dwell on the fearful abuses and enormities to which such doctrines—proclaimed, be it remembered, by an ordained priest and authorized teacher of the Church of Rome—gave rise throughout Germany. When the princes of the Empire were assembled at the Diet of Nuremberg, they made a complaint of their grievances to the Pope; and, in speaking of indulgences, they unanimously state, as the least bad consequence of them, "that the people were cheated of their money by them;" they then go on to point out far more considerable evils arising from the same pernicious source. "Christian piety," they say, "was destroyed by them; all manner of wickedness did spring from thence; men were afraid of committing no kind of sins, when at so cheap a rate they could purchase a remission of them."*

We must conclude, for the present, with noticing a prudent piece of advice about indulgences, given to members of the Church of Rome, by Cardinal Bellarmine. "Though the Church," saith he, "may have power to give indulgences, yet they may want their effect in particular persons, and, therefore, all prudent Christians do so receive indulgences, as withal to satisfy God for their sins."† We hope there are many such "prudent Christians" in Cardinal Wiseman's diocese. The plain meaning of Bellarmine's advice, if he had the courage to speak plainly, is this—that prudent Christians are too wise to believe in indulgences, and that none but fools rely on them; for if there were anything but fraud and imposture in them, why may not a prudent Christian trust a Church which he believes infallible? If Pope Pius IX., on next Easter Sunday, gives a plenary indulgence to every person in the crowd standing at the door of St. Peter's, at Rome, we desire to know why a prudent Christian of that Church may not, yea, ought not to rely upon his word? Does he suspect the head of his Church may cheat and abuse him? If he does, what becomes of infallibility? If he verily believes that the Pope cannot err, and will not deceive, why must not his word be taken? We know not how these things pass current among prudent Christians of the Church of Rome; we would only invite all sincere and earnest members of that Church, who may read what we have written, to contrast the dangerous and contradictory statements of her Popes and divines, on the momentous subject of the forgiveness of sins, with the short and simple statement of the inspired Word of God—"The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from ALL SIN."—1 John i. 7.

OUR LORD GOD THE POPE.

DOMINUS DEUS NOSTER PAPA.

THIS startling, not to say blasphemous, statement was found, during a period of two hundred years, in the Canon Law of the Church of Rome. It occurred in the Gloss upon the Extravagant of John XXII. entitled "*Cum inter*." The Gloss was to the following effect—"To believe that our Lord God the Pope has not the power to decree as he has decreed, is to be deemed heretical."‡ This fearful assertion was naturally laid hold of by the Reformers: and the result of their comments upon it was that the word "God" ("Deus") gradually disappeared from the Gloss, and is now no longer found in the editions of the Canon Law. That modern Roman Catholics should feel anxious to repudiate such a sentiment is not wonderful, when we bear in mind the following points:—

1. St. Paul, speaking of the "Man of Sin," says (2 Thess. ii. 4), that "he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God."
2. Pope Gregory the Great, writing of Antichrist, says, "since he is a damned man and a wicked spirit, he lyingly asserts that he is God."—Greg. in Job, c. 34.
3. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury in the 11th century, also speaking of Antichrist, uses the following words—"He shall feign himself to be religious, that he may deceive men under the colour of piety. Yea, he shall say that he is God: and he shall cause himself to be adored, and shall promise the Kingdom of Heaven."—Anselm in 2 Thess. ii.
4. Long before this, Irenæus, speaking of Antichrist, says, "Being an apostate and a robber, he wishes to be adored as God."—Iren., Contr. Hæc., Lib. v., c. 25.
5. The heathen emperor Domitian headed his proclamations with the words "*Your Lord God Domitian*."—Sueton. in Dom., c. 13. And, similarly, the monster Caligula called himself "*Deus Optimus Maximus*."—Sueton. in Calig., c. 22.

We might expect that when the Reformers urged these and similar points in their controversy with Rome, the Papal authorities would repudiate, as soon as it could be conveniently done, a sentiment which, however useful in the middle ages, could no longer with safety be avowed as the teaching of the Church. It had performed its part in the

great work of building up the edifice of the divine supremacy of the Pope, and might, for the future, be discarded. Yet it seems to have been judged prudent to proceed gradually in the matter. To have at once expunged the obnoxious word *Deum* from the Gloss, would have been too great a concession to the impertinent scruples of Bishop Jewell and other troublesome opponents of the Papal system. Accordingly, when Pope Gregory XIII. appointed a commission in 1582 (nearly twenty years after Jewell had drawn the attention of Europe to the fact that the Pope was God), for the purpose of preparing a new edition of the Canon Law, and with directions to "revise, correct, and expurgate," not only the Text but the Glosses, from unintentional errors as well as designed corruptions, the edition, so prepared (and which is, to the present day, the standard edition), retained the word *Deum*, without even so much as the usual "*Cautela lege*" in the margin. The explanation of this deliberate retention of the word is, doubtless, to be found in the dogma of the spiritual supremacy of the Pope *de jure divino*, combined with the Papal motto of "no retreat" ("*nuquam retrorsum*"). A few years later, however, that is to say, in the beginning of the 17th century, we have the Jesuit Eudæmon Joannes actually denying that the word "God" (*Deum*) was to be found in the original MS. of Zenzelin, the writer of the Gloss in question. As this MS. is deposited in the Vatican Library, and is carefully concealed from the prying eyes of Protestants, we are obliged to take this denial on trust. How little reason there is for believing Eudæmon's unsupported assertion may be seen by consulting Archbishop Abbott's reply, in his *Antilogia*, cap. 5. Indeed, the candid Mr. Charles Butler seems to admit that this was his impression also, when, in his "Justification" (p. 126), he attempts to justify the phrase "Our Lord God the Pope" upon what he considers Scriptural principles, while he, at the same time, allows that "it is in bad taste." Mr. Butler was well aware that, although the word "*Deum*" has been carefully excluded from the more recent editions of the Canon Law, there are abundant other proofs of the title in question being applied to and accepted by the Popes during the middle ages. He knew that Pope Nicholas I., in the 9th century, had said—"It is sufficiently evident that the secular power cannot bind or loose the Pontiff, who, it is clear, was called God by the pious Prince Constantine; and it is manifest that God cannot be judged by men."—Dist. 96, can. 7. Satis eviderit, Decret. Gratian., Prima Pars.* Mr. Butler doubtless knew also that the famous Chancellor Gerson had said of the Popes, in the early part of the 15th century—"In imitation of Lucifer, they wish to be adored as Gods. . . . They neither fear God, nor reverence man."—De Conc. Gen., Oper. vol. ii., p. 27. Mr. Butler knew further that Christopher Marcellus, addressing Pope Julius II., in the name of the Council of Lateran (1512), made use of the following portentous words—"Do thou take care that we lose not the salvation, the life and breath which thou hast given us. For thou art our shepherd, thou our physician, thou our guide, thou, in short, a second God upon earth (tu denique alter Deus in terris).—Harduin ix., 1651." Mr. Butler knew that Cardillus, in his defence of the Council of Trent, calls the Pope an earthly God (*terrenus Deus*). Mr. Butler was acquainted with the ceremonies observed at the inauguration of a Pope: the following account of which is taken from an official authentic source,† published at the close of the 17th century:—

"After the election and proclamation, the Pope, attired in the pontifical habit, is borne in the pontifical chair to the Church of St. Peter, and is placed on the High Altar, where he is saluted for the third time by the cardinals, by kissing his feet, hands, and mouth. In the meantime the Ambrosian Hymn (*Te Deum*) is sung. The adoration being finished, and the hymn over, the dean of the Sacred College chants some versicles and a prayer; then the Pontiff descends from the altar, and is carried to the Vatican Palace. The ceremony takes place in the Church of St. Peter. The Pontiff is placed upon the High Altar of that Church, a spot consecrated, according to the Romish theory of the Eucharist, by the actual presence of the body, soul, and divinity of the Son of God. He sits upon that High Altar, using it as his footstool. And there, enthroned as a king, he is adored as a God! Adored by the cardinal princes of the Roman Church, who kiss the feet which rest on the altar of the Supreme! And that this is no obsolete usage any one may satisfy himself, by reading the account given of the inauguration of the present Pope, Pius IX., in the *Univers*, of the 27th of June, 1846.

Such being the practice of the Church of Rome at the present day, it may well seem an unnecessary concession to the heretical Reformers to have expunged the word "God" from the Gloss in the Canon Law. But upon nearer consideration the policy of doing so becomes apparent. The formal retention of such a sentiment would, undoubtedly, have proved a very great scandal in this inquiring age; while at the same time care is taken to keep up, in reality, by the practice of the Church of Rome, the claim which, in words, has been withdrawn.

* Gobelini Personæ Cosmodrom. Et. 6, c. 168, p. 278. Francf. ed., 1579.
† Vide "Forma absolutionis plenarie" apud Grædesium, *Monumenta Antiquitatis*. Tom. i., no. vii., B. p. 74.

‡ This last assertion is so monstrous that we deem it right to give it in Tetzel's own published words, in which he deliberately maintained and defended it:—"Sub commissariis insuper ac prædicatoribus veniarum imperare, ut si quis impossibile Dei genericum semper vigorem violasset, quod eundem indulgentiarum vigore absolvere possent, tunc clarius est." Postiones tratis J. Tetzel, quibus defendit indulgentias contra Lutherum, Tueses 92, 100, et 101.

* Vide Centum Gravamina, in Fascic. Rur. Exp. et Fug. p. 354. London, 1630.

† Bell. de Indul., l. i., c. 12, vol. 3, p. 663, col. 2. Prag., 1721.

‡ Extravag. Joan. xxii., Tit. xiv., Gloss. in cap. iv.

* We follow the reading "nequam," instead of the common one, "nequamquam."

* It is a very significant fact, that while Bellarmine quotes the first clause of this sentence as far as the word "Pontiff," in proof of the supremacy of the Pope, he carefully omits the latter part.—Bellarm. de Sum. Pontif., lib. ii., c. 26.

† Notitia Congreg. et Tribunal. Cur. Romanæ. a. H. Lettenburg, 1683.